DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 392 HE 021 083

AUTHOR Gentemann, Karen M.; Rogers, Brenda H.
TITLE The Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness: The Responses of Colleges and Universities to Regional Accreditation.
PUB DATE 30 Oct 87
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research and the Society for College and University Planning (New Orleans, LA, October 28-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); Administrative Organization; College Administration; College Planning; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Evaluation; Institutional Research; *Outcomes of Education; *School Effectiveness; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Surveys

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of "institutional effectiveness" is required by many accrediting agencies. The degree to which institutions have mobilized to meet the new criteria is the focus of this study. Surveys were sent to chief executive officers (CEOs) of institutions which will be reviewed within the next 5 years by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Respondents were persons designated by the CEOs as having responsibility for the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. A total of 167 institutions participated, for a response rate of 54%. This paper compares responses by: (1) the type of institutions (highest degree offered, governance, and size); (2) the function of the office responsible for evaluation; and (3) the existence of institutional research offices. Few differences were found across types of institutions. However, the overall results point out specific areas where the majority of institutions are not currently engaged in ongoing, institutional assessment. An important finding of the survey is that the majority of institutions have not approached student outcomes assessment as an ongoing activity with an institution-wide perspective. The implications for the profession of institutional research are discussed. (Author/KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290392

THE EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: THE RESPONSES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO REGIONAL ACCREDITATION

Karen M. Gentemann, Ph.D.

and

Brenda H. Rogers, Ph.D.

North Carolina Central University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SAIR-SCUP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the SAIR-SCUP
Annual Conference in New Orleans, LA,
October 28-30, 1987

HE 021 083

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: THE RESPONSE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO REGIONAL ACCREDITATION

Abstract

The evaluation of "institutional effectiveness" is required by many accrediting agencies. The degree to which institutions have mobilized to meet the new criteria is the focus of this study. Surveys were sent to chief executive officers (CEOs) of institutions which will be reviewed within the next five years by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Respondents were persons designated by the CEOs as having responsibility for the evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

A total of 167 institutions participated, for a response rate of 54%. This paper compares responses by the type of institution: highest degree offered, governance, and size. Also, responses are compared by the function of the office responsible for evaluation and the existence of institutional research offices. Few differences were found across types of institutions. However, the overall results point out specific areas where the majority of institutions are not currently engaged in ongoing, institutional assessment. The implications for the profession of institutional research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Accountability in higher education has become a common theme. Recently regional as well as specialized accrediting agencies have established criteria which are concerned with outcomes assessment. The "institutional effectiveness" section of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Criteria for Accreditation (1987) focuses on the "evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institutional programs"(SACS, 1987, p.10).

Although there has been much written and said about the evaluation of institutional effectiveness, it is not clear to what extent campuses have begun to mobilize efforts to meet these new standards. Particularly institutions without central institutional research offices may lack the resources and skills to meet these new expectations. Moreover, small institutions, two-year colleges, and privately supported institutions may be less prepared for the demands of assessment than larger public four-year institutions.

This study was undertaken to ascertain whether institutions are currently engaged in assessment activities related to the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. It also addresses the question of resources available to support assessment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In an article focusing primarily on the current state of evaluation knowledge regarding student testing, Baker and Herman (1985, p.2) describe the changes in evaluation as a result of legislative action, social trends, and new technology:

> Simple linear models of evaluation, thought to mirror a linear pattern of needs identification, planning, implementation, and evaluation, have been replaced by analyses that recognize the complex interactions of technical, social, structural, and political environments. From simple, controlled studies of outcomes, design and data collection have been augmented to include studies of how policy goals, implementation and multifaceted information interact. Studies of evaluation have been enlarged to reflect a concern that the results be used by a range of decision makers (Baker and Herman, 1985, p.2).

This description closely reflects the changes in the accreditation process. Previously accreditation depended on linear models which assumed a high and positive correlation between inputs--the number of volumes in the library, the percent of PhDs on the faculty, the student-faculty ratio--and the product of a quality institution. Now, however, accrediting agencies emphasize planning, evaluation and research as continuing and dynamic processes.

The focus of accreditation has changed tremendously over the last decade. In the 1970s Troutt (1979), as cited in Feasley (1980, p.28), conducted a content analysis of the published

criteria and standards of the regional accrediting associations. From this study five criteria that supposedly related to quality were common to all accrediting agencies: institutional purposes and objectives, educational programs, financial resources, faculty, and the library/learning center. However, he reported no research to support the relationship between these five criteria and institutional quality (Feasley, 1980, p. 28).

The accrediting agencies have responded to the increasing demand for measures of quality, not by abandoning the traditional standards, but by adding new criteria that examine institutional effectiveness. Just as evaluation as a field has begun to abandon the linear model, so too for the accrediting agencies. The new approaches are not yet crystal clear, but they are certainly more dynamic and more inclined to examine results. Accreditation is emphasizing the evaluation of institutional effectiveness through continual re-examination and reassessment. Thus, the focus of accreditation has moved from resources to results and outcomes (Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1986, and Moore, 1986).

The content of this new orientation is changing also. Lenning (1986) lists numerous "conceptually muddy" areas in higher education where applied research is needed. He includes such areas as "unexpressed student needs; non-academic student development outcomes; and long-term consequences of college for students;...the strategic planning, management, and environmental scanning process; the development of measures and indicators of students' non-academic development" (Lenning, 1986, p.5)--many of the same topics in which accreditation agencies are also interested.

Lest we think that the new evaluation methodologies, the new content focus, and the emphasis on a dynamic process of self-evaluation are solely theoretical constructs, James Rogers, Executive Director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the regional accrediting association in the South, said in an address to the Twelfth National Conference on Blacks in Higher Education: "The whole thrust of this new emphasis [on institutional effectiveness] is to encourage institutions to engage in <u>continuing</u> [emphasis added] study, analysis, and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures, and programs" (Rogers, 1987).

Indeed in a recent survey co-sponsored by the Education Commission of the States, American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) Assessment Forum, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEE)), Boyer et al. (1987) learned that two-thirds of all states have formal assessment initiatives. These actions range from encouraging institutional action to statewide monitoring and mandated statewide testing.

In a survey conducted by the American Council on Education (El-Khawas, 1987), 70% of the administrators reporting agreed that accrediting agencies should <u>require</u> colleges and universities to demonstrate effectiveness. In an issue of the Association for Institutional Research <u>Professional File</u>, Johnson and Christal (1985) recommend that "data collection and studies be done on an ongoing basis instead of once every several years

or in the crisis mode that usually accompanies most self-study or accreditation deadlines" (p.5).

In addition to accreditation pressures, Thrash (1987) says that "the identification and measurement of institutional effectiveness, the assessment of educational outcomes, or whatever terms we choose to call these exercises--have in recent years moved from being esoteric concepts, curiosities and poorly understood terms to becoming an integral part of institutional evaluation and planning" (p.481).

The assessment procedures required to evaluate institutional effectiveness is not without cost both in terms of time and monetary expenditures. Much of the temporal cost is due to internal debates about which methodologies are most appropriate to examine which goals (Warren, 1983) and what it all means. As Moore (1986) puts it, "...it is necessary for [administrators] first to develop within the institution a collective understanding of the nature of the task and then to lead the institution through the steps requisite to its achievement," (p.51) a process which might be characterized as pulling a camel through a hole in a microchip.

Monetarily, we are just beginning to get a glimpse of how expensive this new era of assessment will be. Ewell and Jones (undated paper) wisely caution against assuming astronomical costs when much of what is included in "assessment" is already being done on many campuses by testing centers, offices of institutional research, and academic planning offices. However, Ewell and Jones also point out that their cost estimates are approximate at best since they do not include many of the personnel costs associated with developing, administering, and analyzing locally-produced instruments nor coordination costs and other activities which existing offices presumably perform now.

Further, as Boyer, et al. (1987) discovered, most states that have statewide assessment programs underestimate the costs, particularly with regard to staff time. As Brown (1986) points out, the evaluation of nonacademic units, which is part and parcel of the evaluation process, represents an additional demand on campus resources.

In his presidential address to the Association for Institutional Research 1987 Forum, Don Reichard stressed the long-term and far-reaching effects of the assessment of institutional effectiveness:

> If we are to respond to the mandate to look increasingly at results, it will mean a reordering of priorities and investment in staff and systems. It also must mean collaboration, sharing, and joint development if we are to afford the needed systems and efforts (Reichard, 1987).

Whether willingly or not, once the commitment has been made to participate in an ongoing evaluation of the institution, colleges and universities must all undergo a somewhat similar process. Their historical commitment to self-evaluation will determine whether they start from ground zero or slightly above.

Moore (1986) describes three broad but critical steps which must be taken to examine the illusive "effectiveness" issue. She includes (1) the development of meaningful statements of institutional mission and goals, (2) the design and implementation of an institutional planning process, and (3) the identification of indicators of effectiveness.

The identification of criteria appropriate for judging institutional effectiveness is perhaps one of the most difficult tasks facing higher education. Fincher (1978) argues for criteria that focus on educational outcomes if the purposes and goals are stated in terms of student learning. Social, economic, and political effects are too far removed from the educational process to serve as valid criteria measures, according to Fincher (1978). Regardless of whether short-term or long-term effects are selected, administrators, faculty, and the public must agree upon criterion measures against which to judge the institution's success.

The evaluation process has begun for many institutions, either because of their own wish to do so or because of external demands, or more likely because of a multitude of reasons. But where do institutions which must present evidence of institutional effectiveness to an accrediting agency stand with regard to the process? Are they at ground zero? Or are only some institutions at ground zero, and if so, which ones? What characterizes an institution which is well-prepared to assess its effectiveness?

While the new methodologies and orientation towards accreditation and evaluation are exciting in some quarters, institutions required to carry out the new mandates may describe the process in terms other than "challenging."

The present study attempts to shed light on the question of where the institutions are vis-a-vis the new evaluation mode. Institutions accredited by the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS) constituted the sample for the study, but the findings should be useful across the U.S. as the demands of accreditation change from an examination of resources to one of outcomes and effectiveness.

Specifically the research addresses the extent to which institutions that will be reaccredited within the next five years by SACS are currently assessing institutional effectiveness. Differences in institutions' involvement in assessment activities and in the support for the office responsible for assessment are compared for public versus private institutions, by the level of institution, and by high versus low enrollment.

METHODOLOGY

SACS provided the following information for the study: name of institution, address, chief executive officer, initial and reaffirmation dates of accreditation, governance (public vs. private), level (I, II, III, IV), and enrollment. Level I institutions are community and technical colleges; Level II institutions offer four-year degrees only; Level III institutions

are comprehensive colleges and universities, offering master's and professional degrees; and Level IV institutions are doctoral-granting universities.
Enrollment is divided into high and low enrollment based on the median enrollment of participating institutions.

Institutions that will be reaccredited within the next five years constituted the sample. A total of 311 institutions met this criteria, representing 50% of the total.

The worksheet for the required statements of the Criteria for Accreditation: Commission on Colleges (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1987) served as the basis for the first 31 items on the questionnaire. These items describe evaluation, planning, and institutional research activities required to comply with Section III, Institutional Effectiveness Criteria. The wording of the items closely resembles the sentences on the worksheet. For each activity respondents indicate if it were "performed systematically and campus-wide," "either not systematic or ...not campus-wide," "unknown," or "not applicable." If the activity were performed on a regular, campus-wide basis, then the respondents indicate the extent to which their offices carried out this activity. The response categories are "not at all," "somewhat," "to a large extent," and "completely responsible."

The next part of the questionnaire pertains to the resources available to the respondents' offices. First the respondents assess the adequacy of the budget, the size of the staff, and the knowledge, skills and experience of the staff to carry out activities for which their offices are currently responsible. Then they assess the adequacy of resources for carrying out all the evaluation, planning, and research activities described in the first set of items. Each question has five possible responses, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Three experts in institutional research who were very familiar with the Criteria reviewed the instrument and offered suggestions that were incorporated when possible. Approximately ten institutional research and planning directors completed the final draft of the survey as a part of the pretest.

The chief executive officer received a letter with the questionnaire attached. The letter asked that he/she direct the questionnaire to "the person who will provide the data and analysis to support the evaluation process" required for the institution's accreditation. The letter stated that in many cases the person will be the director of institutional research, but that persons with other titles may be assigned this responsibility.

The Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia printed and mailed the surveys in the winter of 1987. Chief executive officers returned a postcard indicating that their institution would participate in the survey and giving the name of the individual who would respond to the questionnaire. Chief executive officers who had not returned the postcard received a follow-up mailing. Several weeks after the due date of February 27, 1987, we identified institutions that had agreed to participate but had not returned the questionnaire.

We telephoned the person whom the chief executive officer had indicated would respond to the survey to encourage participation.

The persons whom the chief executive officers designated as responsible for the research and data analysis completed the surveys, including information about their titles and the offices to which they report. Also organizational charts were returned with the surveys by approximately 43%.

Two derived variables are the function of the respondent's office and the existence of an institutional research office. The function of the office was coded based on the respondent's title, with titles designating responsibilities for research, evaluation, and/or planning contituting one category and all other titles grouped into another category. The existence of an institutional research office was based on three sources of information. If the title of the person responding was director/coordinator of institutional research, we concluded that such an office existed. Of those institutions that sent organizational charts, the listing of an institutional research or research/evaluation office led to the conclusion that such an office existed. In the absence of other information, the HEP 87 Higher Education Directory (Higher Education Publications, 1987) was used. A code of 09 indicated that the college had an institutional research office.

After the coding of variables, the data were entered into a data set, and SAS was used for both file manipulation and data analysis.

The relationship of governance, level, and enrollment to the first 31 items is tested using a chi square analysis. Responses of "not applicable" were collapsed with "unknown" and "activity not systematic or not campus-wide" except for six items which were judged inappropriate for some institutions. For these six items, responses of "not applicable" were omitted from the analyses. Further analysis explored the relationship of research, planning, and evaluation activities to the existence of an institutional research office and the function of the office given the assignment of carrying out the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Because of the large number of items, a conservative alpha of .01 is used.

The items relating to resources and scale scores, created by summing across variables, are analyzed using the general linear model (GLM). An alpha of .05 is used in these analyses.

For scale scores, responses of "systematic and campus-wide" were scored as 2, "not systematic or not campus-wide" as 1, and "unknown" or "not applicable" (when judged applicable to all institutions) as 0. The institutional effectiveness scale is the sum of the 31 items. This scale has a reliability coefficient for internal consistency of .88. The three subscales are Evaluation, with 18 items and a reliability coefficient of .77; Planning, with 4 items, and a reliability coefficient of .65; and Institutional Research, with 9 items and a reliability coefficient of .76.

RESULTS

A total of 167 institutions participated in the study, for a response rate of 54%. The institutions who participated in the study are representative of the institutions that will be reaccredited within the next five years. Institutions that responded to the survey do not differ significantly from those that did not respond when compared by state, governance, level, and enrollment.

The majority that participated in the study were public institutions (65%). Approximately half (46%) were Level I institutions; 21%, Level II; 20%, Level III, and 13%, Level IV. Of the 108 public institutions, the majority (60%) are Level I institutions. In contrast, of the 59 private institutions, 51% are Level II institutions.

Sixty-one percent of the 167 institutions do not have institutional research offices. A slightly higher proportion of private as compared to public institutions do not have institutional research offices (65% versus 57%). Only 41% of the respondents work in an office of research, evaluation, or planning. The range of respondents' titles is extensive, from chief executive officer to faculty serving as chair of the self-study committee.

In Table 1 are the percentages of institutions reporting that the evaluation, planning, and institutional research activities are currently performed at least every five years on a campus-wide basis. Percentages for all respondents as well as public and private institutions are presented.

Over 90% report that the evaluation of full-time faculty is a regular, campus-wide activity. Seventy-two percent indicate that they have established guidelines for the use of faculty evaluations and procedures for planning and evaluation. Two-thirds have defined a process for curricular planning, review, and evaluation. Seventy percent carry out evaluations of part-time faculty and of the curriculum. Other activities that the majority of institutions do on a regular, campus-wide basis are the development of plans for facilities (69%), faculty workload studies (66%), evaluations of library (61%), studies of the effectiveness of instruction (59%), the development of plans for maintenance of property (57%), the development of plans for faculty assignments (56%), evaluations of administrators (56%), linkage of planning to the budget process (52%), and the evaluation of student development services (50%).

Student outcomes are defined by 41%, and 44% carry out evaluations of student achievement and outcomes. One third of respondents currently evaluate institutional research and show the relationship of institutional research to planning and evaluation.

Of those institutions whose mission includes public service mission, 47% develop goals for continuing education, 48% conduct evaluations of off-campus programs, 30% document the effectiveness of continuing education, and 23% evaluate the public service mission. For institutions which have graduate

teaching assistants, 46% evaluate their effectiveness. For institutions with a research mission, only 33% evaluate t mission.

The analysis by governance (public versus private institution), level, and enrollment yielded few significant differences. Because of the large number of chi square analyses, an alpha level of .01 was used.

Public and private institutions had significantly different responses on only three items. Proportionately more public than private institutions evaluate the effectiveness of the public service mission (30% vs. 11%) when responses were limited to those who have a public service mission. A larger percentage of the public institutions as compared to private institutions (66% vs. 41%) have a maintenance plan for the upkeep of their property. Finally proportionately more public than private institutions (80% vs. 50%) develop a facilities plan for the entire campus.

The level of the institution was statistically significant in three cases. Almost two-thirds (65%) of Level I (community and technical colleges) institutions report that evaluations of off-campus programs are carried out, as compared to about one-third of Level II and Level III and 19% of Level IV institutions. Proportionately more Level I institutions (86%) conduct evaluations of part-time faculty, whereas 66% of Level II, 63% of Level III, and 50% of Level IV institutions systematically evaluate part-time faculty. Proportionately fewer Level IV (doctoral-granting) institutions (71%) evaluate full-time faculty on a regular, campus-wide basis, as compared to Level I (94%), Level II (91%), and Level III (97%) institutions.

Student enrollment related to four activities. Larger institutions were more likely to report the establishment of procedures for institutional planning and evaluation (81% vs. 64%) and the development of a facilities plan (81% vs. 57%) than were smaller institutions. Institutions with high student enrollment were also more likely to report evaluating institutional research activities (44% vs. 23%) and to demonstrate that institutional research supports planning and evaluation (45% vs. 23%).

Not surprisingly, institutions with institutional research offices were more likely to report systematic, campus-wide activity in evaluating institutional research activities (51% vs. 32%) and in demonstrating that institutional research supports planning and evaluation (45% vs. 25%). However, the existence of institutional research offices did not relate significantly at the .01 level to any of the other items.

If the function of the office assigned responsibility for the evaluation of institutional effectiveness was research, planning, and/or evaluation, then the institutions were more likely to be involved in these campus-wide activities: the establishment of procedures for institutional planning and evaluation (86% vs. 63%); research on institutional purposes, policies, procedures, and programs (64% vs. 36%); the evaluation of institutional research activities (52% vs. 21%); and the demonstration that institutional research supports planning and

evaluation (53% vs. 21%).

The responses to questions relating to resources varied greatly depending on whether the question referred to the office's present responsibilities or all the activities required to assess institutional effectiveness. The majority (55%) indicate that their budget is adequate to carry out present responsibilities, whereas 77% state that the budget is not large enough to assume all the planning, evaluation, and research activities mandated by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. However, 55% state that the staff is not large enough to carry out current responsibilities; and 81%, that their staff is inadequate for all activities pertaining to the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Whereas two-thirds state that their staff have sufficient knowledge, skill, and experience for performing their current jobs, 55% say that their staff does not have the expertise to assume responsibility for the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. (Refer to Table 3.)

Means by governance, level, and student enrollment were not statistically different. The existence of an institutional research office related to this item: "My staff is large enough to carry out all activities listed above." Institutions with institutional research offices were less likely to agree with this statement than those without institutional research offices (1.63 vs. 2.01). Respondents who were in offices responsible for research, evaluation and/or planning were also less likely to agree with this statement than those whose offices had other functions (1.66 vs. 2.01).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

These results, in general, did not identify major differences across types of institutions in the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The few differences that emerged were not surprising.

An important finding of this survey are that the majority of institutions have not approached student outcomes assessment as an ongoing activity with an institution-wide perspective. This picture confirms Secretary Bennett's view that traditionally institutions of higher education have focused on the evaluation of inputs--resources such as facilities, faculty, library books--and have not attempted to assess outputs--what students have learned as a result of attending college (The Raleigh News and Observer, p. 22A). The new emphasis by accrediting agencies on the assessment of outcomes will pose challenges for institutions. The definition of expected outcomes, currently done by 44% of the institutions in the sample, is the first step toward the development of assessment procedures. Only a third have recommended or selected ways of evaluating the achievement of educational outcomes. Within the next few years these institutions must demonstrate that they are evaluating the achievement of student outcomes and are using this information in program improvement. Certainly the data suggest that the assessment of student outcomes is an area of weakness among many institutions, regardless of size, governance, and level.

All institutions must designate an administrative unit responsible for institutional research and have a process for evaluating its effectiveness. However, in this sample only 39% have formal institutional research offices. Only 42% of the offices responding to the survey function as research, planning, and/or evaluation offices. Before accreditation, responsibilities for planning and evaluation must be administratively assigned. Furthermore, institutions will have to develop procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of institutional research. The results suggest that many new organizational units with institutional research responsibilities will emerge in the next few years.

From these results we conclude that institutions have been less concerned about the assessment of research and public service activities than those directly related to instruction in degree-granting programs. Other areas that will receive emphasis in the next few years are the evaluation of the research mission, continuing education, extension work, and the public service mission.

The offices which are responsible for the analytical support for the accreditation process indicate that they need more staff in order to carry out their present activities. To assume responsibility for all activities related to the assessment of institutional effectiveness, the offices will need larger budgets, more staff, and staff with more expertise. Overall, these findings are consistent across different types of institutions. This picture indicates that institutions with broad missions of teaching, research, and public service must engage in more new assessment activities than institutions with the more specific mission of undergraduate teaching. The survey does not provide answers about the extent to which institutions are planning for these assessments. A follow-up survey of the same institutions, after they have undergone accreditation, would provide information about changes in research, planning, and evaluation activities. If the new Criteria accomplish the intent, we expect that the assessment of institutional effectiveness will be a continuous process. We also expect that information gained from the assessment procedure will be used in institutional planning and result in discernible changes.

It is somewhat heartening to learn that all institutions are doing something to prepare for accreditation. Unfortunately, not all are doing enough--far from it. The disconcerting fact is that less than half of the institutions report evaluation efforts in 16 of the 31 areas. Contrary to expectation, no institutional characteristic distinguishes those who are actively engaged in continuous, campus-wide assessment from those who are less involved in institutional assessment. Neither size, nor level, nor governance has strong relationships to the evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

A disturbing finding is that the presence of an institutional research office has little effect on assessment activities. Perhaps Pace's description of the dilemma of institutional research offices provides us with insight into the

reasons:

> One might suppose that the institutional research office within the college would be the natural locus for ongoing institutional case study. But it might not be. Most such offices are beset by deadlines and heavily involved in basic accounting activities related to budget making, cost analysis, and similar matters, all of which orient the staff and its activities to serve administration and management....A case study needs data, in large amounts, but it also requires time for exploration, for reflection, and for thoughtful evaluation. Some insti-utional research offices have the capacity for educational evaluation as well as institutional accounting. Some do not (Pace,1979, p.124).

Not surprising is that those serving in a research capacity were most likely to indicate insufficient staff resources to carry out the full array of evaluation and planning activities. They, better than anyone, know the dilemma described by Pace and the extent of work required to conduct quality evaluations.

These findings lead to recommendations for all institutions--regardless of size, public or private, doctoral or two-year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First all institutions should designate an administrative unit responsible for institutional research activities. In this sample, only 39% have institutional research offices and only 42% of those responding to the survey function, at least in part, as research, planning and/or evaluation offices. Clearly defining the roles of the office in the assessment of institutional effectiveness should assist in eliminating activities that detract from well-thought out assessment.

Second the research office must be sufficiently staffed so that it can carry out the "case study" described by Pace (1979), a necessary activity to satisfy accreditation demands. Across institutions, our respondents indicate the need for more staff just to carry out present activities. To assume responsibility for <u>all</u> assessment activities, the offices will need larger budgets, more staff, and more experienced, knowledgeable staff. As Pace (1979) suggested nearly a decade ago, technical expertise is often the selection criteria for a director of institutional research. However, to carry out an "institutional case study" requires a much broader knowledge of higher education, teaching and learning, student development, and organizational dynamics than specialized skill in data systems. Similar concerns were expressed by Van Maanen (1987) in his keynote address to the Association for Institutional Research, in which he called for institutional researchers to expand their horizons beyond the tabulation of data and into a context of assessment.

The survey results indicate a need for more staff and a more highly knowledgeable staff to carry out all assessment activities. Thus while an expansion of staff is critical to

fulfilling accreditation requirements, the qualifications of the staff may be more important. Experience in program evaluation and testing is more critical now than in the past.

Third, college and university administrators must recognize that costs are associated with the new accreditation requirements. The costs cannot simply be absorbed by existing units, both because of the need for well-trained researchers but also because few institutions are currently carrying out all the required activities. For instance, institutions have to develop procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of institutional research, their public service mission, and their research activities. The area of student outcomes research alone can cost thousands of dollars, as institutions either purchase existing instruments or undertake the complex and expensive process of locally developing and validating instruments. Institutions can not simply add on to these tasks without increasing office budgets substantially.

It was hoped that the survey would suggest an organizational structure for supporting assessment activities. However, the questionnaire data do not indicate that the organizational placement of the office responsible for analytical support is critical. Future research will focus on the outcomes of the accreditation process. For instance, are institutions indicating systematic, campus-wide research, evaluation, and planning activities better prepared for their reviews? Does the evaluation of institutional effectiveness lead to changes in the institution? Is the review process aided by the existence of an institutional research office? Where are the new research offices, established in response to the SACS criteria, located in the organization and what responsibilities are assigned to these offices? What kind of on-going institutional support is given to evaluation activities? It is expected that new organizational structures will appear to enable institutions to respond to the demands for accountability.

Table 1

Percent of Institutions Carrying Out Activity on a Systematic, Campus-Wide Basis

	ALL	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Conduct evaluations of full-time faculty	90.8	90.4	91.5
Establish guidelines for the use of faculty evaluations	72.4	72.1	72.9
Establish procedures for institutional planning and evaluation	72.4	76.9	64.4
Conduct evaluations of part-time faculty	69.9	72.1	66.1
Conduct evaluations of curricula	69.8	69.9	69.5
Develop a facilities plan for the institution	68.9	79.6	50.0
Define a process for curricular planning, review, and evaluation	66.9	72.1	57.6
Conduct studies of faculty workload	65.6	68.3	61.0
Conduct evaluations of library services and programs	60.7	63.5	55.9
Conduct studies of the effectiveness of instruction	59.3	57.3	62.7
Develop a maintenance plan for upkeep of institutional property	57.1	66.0	41.4
Conduct evaluations of administrators	56.4	62.5	45.8
Develop a plan for the assignment of faculty responsibilities	56.2	57.7	53.5
Demonstrate that educational planning guides budget preparation	51.9	55.8	44.8
Conduct evaluations of student development services	49.7	51.9	45.8
Conduct evaluations of off-campus programs	47.8	53.4	28.0

Table 1 continued

Percent of Institutions Carrying Out Activity on a Systematic, Campus-Wide Basis

	ALL	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Carry out research studies of institutional purposes,etc.	47.5	50.0	43.1
Develop goals for continuing education and extension	47.1	49.0	41.7
Conduct evaluations of admissions policies	46.9	45.6	49.2
Conduct evaluations of graduate teaching assistants	46.2	45.5	50.0
Conduct evaluations of student outcomes	43.6	46.2	39.0
Document that evaluations are used to improve teaching	42.6	44.7	39.0
Define expected student outcomes	40.5	44.2	33.9
Conduct evaluations of the safety plan	37.7	43.3	27.6
Demonstrate that institutional research supports planning,etc.	33.7	39.4	23.7
Evaluate institutional research	33.1	36.5	27.1
Recommend methods of educational assessment	33.1	33.7	32.2
Evaluate institution's research mission	33.0	37.1	23.1
Document effectiveness of continuing education, extension, etc.	29.8	33.3	20.5
Document that evaluation of students discriminates high and low achievement	28.8	29.4	27.6
Evaluate public service mission	23.4	29.6	10.6

Table 2

Percent of Institutions Carrying Out Activity on a Systematic, Campus-Wide Basis By Level

	LEVEL			
	I	II	III	IV
Conduct evaluations of full-time faculty	94	91	97	71
Establish guidelines for the use of faculty evaluations	75	65	74	71
Establish procedures for institutional planning and evaluation	70	59	87	81
Conduct evaluations of part-time faculty	84	62	61	43
Conduct evaluations of curricula	69	71	77	62
Develop a facilities plan for the institution	78	48	71	67
Define a process for curricular planning, review, and evaluation	71	56	71	62
Conduct studies of faculty workload	69	59	61	71
Conduct evaluations of library services and programs	69	44	58	62
Conduct studies of the effectiveness of instruction	65	56	57	48
Develop a maintenance plan for upkeep of institutional property	67	36	55	57
Conduct evaluations of administrators	66	32	61	52
Develop a plan for the assignment of faculty responsibilities	62	48	55	48
Demonstrate that educational planning guides budget preparation	56	42	58	43
Conduct evaluations of student development services	55	41	48	48

Table 2 continued

Percent of Institutions Carrying Out Activity on a Systematic, Campus-Wide Basis by Level

	LEVEL			
	I	II	III	IV
Conduct evaluations of off-campus programs	65	33	32	19
Carry out research studies of institutional purposes,etc.	43	33	65	62
Develop goals for continuing education and extension	54	27	48	45
Conduct evaluations of admissions policies	47	38	57	48
Conduct evaluations of graduate teaching assistants	0	100	57	35
Conduct evaluations of student outcomes	49	41	23	33
Document that evaluations are used to improve teaching	46	47	35	33
Define expected student outcomes	49	41	23	33
Conduct evaluations of the safety plan	40	27	42	38
Demonstrate that institutional research supports planning,etc.	35	21	35	48
Evaluate institutional research	30	26	45	38
Recommend methods of educational assessment	40	26	23	33
Evaluate institution's research mission	35	13	30	47
Document effectiveness of continuing education, extension, etc.	32	25	25	35
Document that evaluation of students discriminates high and low achievement	32	33	17	29
Evaluate public service mission	25	12	17	43

Table 3
Agreement with Statements Relating to Office Resources

	Percentage of Respondents				
	SD	D	U	A	SA
The budget for my office is adequate to carry out activities for which my office is responsible	10	26	9	50	5
My staff is large enough to carry out the activities for which my office is responsible.	17	38	9	34	2
My staff has the knowledge, skills, and experience to carry out the activities for which my office is responsible.	2	21	10	48	19
The budget for my office is adequate to carry out all activities listed.	37	41	8	14	<1
My staff is large enough to carry out all activities listed.	42	39	10	8	<1
My staff has the knowledge, skills, and experience to carry out all the activities listed.	21	35	12	26	6

SD = Strongly disagree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
A = Agree
SA = Strongly agree

Table 4
Means of Planning, Evaluation, Institutional Research, and Institutional Effectiveness Scales

	EVAL	PLAN	IR	TOTAL
Governance				
Public	19.47	6.11	12.00	37.54
Private	18.63	5.64	10.56	34.67
Level				
I	20.01	6.17	11.80	37.89
II	17.81	5.71	9.93	33.10
III	19.03	5.84	12.16	37.13
IV	18.38	5.67	11.67	35.71
Enrollment				
High	19.05	6.13	12.20	37.32
Low	19.28	5.77	10.80	35.76
IR Office				
Yes	18.08	6.03	11.76	35.85
No	19.83	5.90	11.35	36.96
Function				
Research	18.83	6.23	12.27	37.19
Other	19.40	5.75	10.99	36.10

REFERENCES

Baker, E.L. and Herman, J.L. (1985). Educational evaluation: Emergent needs for research. Evaluation Comment 7(2).

Boyer, C.M., Ewell, P.T., Finney, J.E., and Mingle, J.R. (1987). Assessment and outcomes measurement: A view from the States. AAHE Bulletin 39(7): 8-12.

Brown, M.K. (1986). Evaluation of nonacademic units, a new challenge for IR. Paper presented at the Southern Association for Institutional Research/Southern College and University Planners Annual Meeting, Pipestem, West Virginia, October 1986.

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (Winter 1986). Education quality and accreditation: A call for diversity,continuity and innovation. Accreditation, The Quarterly Newsletter of the Council on Postsecondary Education 11(1),1-5.

El-Khawas,E. (1987). Campus Trends 1987. ACE, Division of Policy Analysis and Research: Washington, DC.

Ewell, P.T. and Jones, D.P. [no date]. The Costs of Assessment. Boulder,CO: NCHEMS, Contract no. 400-83-0009.

Feasley, C.E. (1980). Program Evaluation. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No.2, 1980. Washington,DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Fincher, C. (1978). Importance of criteria for institutional goals. In Robert H. Fenske (Ed.). Using goals in research and planning(1-15). New Directions for Institutional Research (19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

HEP 87 Higher Education Directory (1987). Higher Education Publications.

Johnson, F.C. and Christal, M.E. (1985). Preparing for self-study. The AIR Professional File. No.22.

Lenning, O.T. (1986). College students: Boiling it down. The Pen: Postsecondary Education Network. Washington, DC: AERA, 5-6.

Moore, K.M. (1986). Assessment of institutional effectiveness. In John Losak (ed.), Applying Institutional Research in Decision Making. New Directions for Community Colleges,56: 49-60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The Raleigh News and Observer (September 6, 1987). Bennett wants college accreditation linked to what students learn. p. 22A.

Pace, C.R. (1979). Measuring outcomes of college: Five years findings and recommendations for the future. San Francisco: 1979.

Reichard, D. (1987). Presidential address given at the Twenty-Seventh Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum, held in Kansas City, Missouri.

Rogers, J. (1987). Accreditation: Its national and regional value in 1987. Paper presented at the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education's Twelfth National Conference on Blacks in Higher Education. Washington,DC, April 9-12, 1987.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Criteria for Accreditation: Commission on Colleges. Atlanta: SACS. 1987.

Thrash, P.T. (1987). A report on the role of outcomes evaluation in accreditation process. North Central Association Quarterly 61(4): 481-490.

Troutt, W.E. (1979). Regional accreditation evaluative criteria and quality assurance. Journal of Higher Education 50: 199-210.

Van Maanen,J. (1987). Managing education better. Keynote address to the 27th Annual Forum of The Association for Institutional Research, Kansas City, Missouri.

Warren, J.R. (ed.). (1983). Meeting the new standards. In New Directions for Higher Education. Ed. Martin Kramer. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1-7.